



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

PENROSE LUCAS ALBRIGHT, ESQ.  
MASON, MASON & ALBRIGHT  
P.O. BOX 2246  
ARLINGTON, VA 22202-0246

**COPY MAILED**

MAR 26 2008

**OFFICE OF PETITIONS**

|                                       |   |                      |
|---------------------------------------|---|----------------------|
| In re Application of                  | : |                      |
| Berg et al.                           | : |                      |
| Application No. 09/855,535            | : | DECISION ON PETITION |
| Filed: May 16, 2001                   | : |                      |
| Attorney Docket No. 04132.0099.00US00 | : |                      |

This is a decision on the petition under the unintentional provisions of 37 CFR 1.137(b), filed February 28, 2008, to revive the above-identified application.

The petition is **GRANTED**.

The petition satisfies the requirements of 37 CFR 1.137(b) in that petitioner has supplied (1) the reply in the form of an Election, (2) the petition fee, and (3) a proper statement of unintentional delay.

There is no indication that the person signing the instant petition was ever given a power of attorney or authorization of agent to prosecute the above-identified application. If the person signing the instant petition desires to receive future correspondence regarding this application, the appropriate power of attorney or authorization of agent must be submitted. While a courtesy copy of this decision is being mailed to the person signing the instant petition, all future correspondence will be directed solely to the address currently of record until such time as appropriate instructions are received to the contrary.

It is not apparent whether the statement of unintentional delay was signed by a person who would have been in a position of knowing that the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b) was unintentional. Nevertheless, in accordance with 37 CFR 10.18, the statement is accepted as constituting a certification of unintentional delay. However, in the event that petitioner has no knowledge that the delay was unintentional, petitioner must make such an inquiry to ascertain that, in fact, the delay was unintentional. If petitioner discovers that the delay was intentional, petitioner must notify the Office.

An extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136 must be filed prior to the expiration of the maximum extendable period for reply. See In re Application of S., 8 USPQ2d 1630, 1631 (Comm'r Pats. 1988). Accordingly, since the \$2230.00 extension of time fee submitted with the petition on February 28, 2008 was subsequent to the maximum extendable period for reply, this fee is unnecessary and will be credited to petitioner's deposit account as authorized.

Telephone inquiries concerning this decision should be directed to the undersigned at (571) 272-3206.

This matter is being referred to Technology Center 3643 for further examination on the merits.

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Liana Walsh".

Liana Walsh  
Petitions Examiner  
Office of Petitions

Cc: HOWREY LLP  
2941 FAIRVIEW PARK DRIVE  
BOX 7  
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22042